

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of the present application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29 were pending in the present application, and Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29-41 are now pending.

The Notice of Panel Decision dated December 11, 2007, upholds the rejections of the final Office Action dated August 2, 2007, in which all of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,301,586 to Yang ("the Yang patent").

Applicant appreciates the opportunity to conduct and interview with the current Examiner for this case, Alvin Tan, on February 11, 2008. Applicant has amended numerous claims in view of the interview, and presents the following remarks in response to the rejections of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of the Office Action are overcome and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance for at least the following reasons.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Attorney for Applicant, Chris Gegg, and the current Examiner, Alvin Tan, conducted a telephone interview on February 11, 2008. Several differences between the Yang patent and the present invention were discussed, including potential amendments to the claims to distinguish the "slideshow" functions of the Yang patent and the "speed browsing" functions of the present invention. Differences between manual and automated (computer-controlled) features were discussed, as well as perceived similarities but functional differences between the Yang patent and the present invention. No specific agreements were reached during the interview. Rather, it was merely discussed that certain amendments to the claims, including and similar to those presented herewith, could help to distinguish the claims to the present invention and the Yang patent.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29 as anticipated by the Yang patent. Applicant respectfully submits that the interpretation of the Yang patent in the Office Action and its application to the pending claims are inaccurate and/or incomplete. Applicant previously argued, and still maintains, that the Yang patent does not teach or suggest automatically alternating the browse speed of the view. As stated in the Office Action, the Yang patent teaches "automatically start showing the images one by one at certain time intervals with some smooth transition between the two images," apparently relying upon the disclosure of an "automatic" viewer mode disclosed at column 23, lines 13-21. However, this disclosure confirms Applicant's interpretation of the Yang patent and lack of any teaching or suggestion of automatically altering the browse speed of the view. The Yang patent only describes browsing that involves an automatic viewer mode that providing for browsing at "certain time intervals" or manually controlled browsing. Nothing in the Yang patent discloses or teaches that the *speed of the browsing* is *automatically*

altered. The Yang patent merely discloses that browsing can “automatically *start*,” presumably from a status of not-browsing, rather than altering the speed of the browsing. The pending claims do *not* recite automatically starting a browse mode, as is suggested by cited language from the Yang patent in the Office Action. And Applicant submits that automatically starting browsing is not the same as, nor teaches, automatically altering the speed of browsing. The two concepts are not the same, nor related in such a way that automatically altering the speed of browsing is suggested by automatically starting browsing.

However, to further prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, and numerous dependent claims to more clearly and fully distinguish the manual and automated slideshow functionality of the Yang patent from the claimed invention. In this respect, amended Claim 1 now recites, “the second instructions further adapted to provide the ability to browse for media files matching a chosen browse parameter ***and according to a manually-controlled speed of the browsing determined by the relative deflected position of the media handle from a centerline position for the media handle, and the second instructions further adapted to automatically decrease the manually-controlled speed of the browsing by computer program instruction control when a media file having the chosen browse parameter approaches or is in the media view.***” Amended claims 22 and 24 include similar limitations.

Nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests browsing at “a manually-controlled speed... determined by the relative deflected position of the media handle from a centerline position for the media handle.” And nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests to “automatically decrease the manually-controlled speed of the browsing by computer program instruction control when a media file having the chosen browse parameter approaches or is in the media view.” Rather, the Yang patent merely teaches fully manual browsing or fully automated browsing. In the Yang patent, a user can switch between manual and automated browsing, but the two functions are not interrelated. And when the automated browsing of the Yang patent stays on an image to play one or more associated sound files, the delay is relative to the automated browsing, not a manually-controlled speed of browsing determined by the relative deflected position of a media handle from a centerline position for the media handle.

Further, with respect to Claim 7, and similar to the remarks presented above, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “decreasing the speed of browsing in relation to the distance of the approaching media file and extent of a deviation of the media handle from the centerline position.” The final Office Action cites only to Fig. 11 in the Yang patent which merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 7 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 8, and similar to the remarks presented above, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “increasing the speed of the browsing when a media file having the chosen browse parameter bypasses the centerline position of a view generated by the computer program product.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 10 and column 19, lines 54-62 in the Yang patent. Fig. 10 merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations. And the recitation at column 19, lines 54-62 merely discloses that a user can press a “Next” button to advance a display setup process, but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 8 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 9, and like dependent claims, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “increasing the speed of the browsing in relation to the distance of the bypassing media file and extent of a deviation of the media handle from the centerline position.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 10 and column 19, lines 54-62 in the Yang patent. Fig. 10 merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations. And the recitation at column 19, lines 54-62 merely discloses that a user can press a “Next” button to advance a display setup process, but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 9 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 11, and like dependent claims, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “generating a calendar view that represents time in calendar format and associates events with respective periods of time.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 9 and column 5, lines 43-48 in the Yang patent. Fig. 8 does not show a calendar format. And the recitation at column 5, lines 43-48 does not teach or suggest generating a calendar view that represents time in a calendar format. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 11 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 15, and like dependent claims, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “a browsing step function that is proportional to a movement of the media handle along a time bar.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 6 and column 21, lines 60-65 in the Yang patent. Fig. 6 merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations, such as “a browsing *step* function.” Similarly, the recitation at column 21, lines 60-65 merely discloses the possible inclusion of horizontal or vertical scroll bars and that with such scroll bars “The users can scroll up and down or left to right to view more records or fields,” but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 15 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 18, and like dependent claims, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “a speed of browsing that accelerates when the media handle is deviated a certain distance from the centerline position on the view of the computer program product.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 6 and column 21, lines 60-65 in the Yang patent. Fig. 6 merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations, such as accelerating the browsing speed based upon deviation of a medial handle from a centerline position. Similarly, the recitation at column 21, lines 60-65 merely discloses the possible inclusion of horizontal or vertical scroll bars and that with such scroll bars “The users can scroll up and down or left to right to view more records or fields,” but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 18 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 19, and like dependent claims, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “increasing the speed of browsing as the distance from the centerline position is increased.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 6 and column 21, lines 60-65 in the Yang patent. Fig. 6 merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations. Similarly, the recitation at column 21, lines 60-65 merely discloses the possible inclusion of horizontal or vertical scroll bars and that with such scroll bars “The users can scroll up and down or left to right to view more records or fields,” but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 19 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 20, and like dependent claims, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “decreasing the speed of browsing as the distance from the centerline position is decreased.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 6 and column 21, lines 60-65 in the Yang patent. Fig. 6 merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations. Similarly, the recitation at column 21, lines 60-65 merely discloses the possible inclusion of horizontal or vertical scroll bars and that with such scroll bars “The users can scroll up and down or left to right to view more records or fields,” but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 20 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 21, and like dependent claims, nothing in the Yang patent discloses or suggests “increasing the speed of the browsing when the media file having the chosen browse parameter bypasses the viewable area of the display.” The final Office Action cites to Fig. 6 and column 21, lines 60-65 in the Yang patent. Fig. 6 merely discloses a scroll bar, but not the recited claim limitations. Similarly, the recitation at column 21, lines 60-65 merely discloses the possible inclusion of horizontal or vertical scroll bars and that with such scroll bars “The users can scroll up and down or left to right to view more records or fields,” but not the recited claim limitations. Thus, in addition to the remarks above with respect to

independent Claims 1, 22, and 24, Applicant submits that Claim 21 and similar dependent claims are patentable for this additional reason.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that rejections of the final Office Action are overcome by the present amendments to the claims and that all of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29-41 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims of the present application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper, such as fees for a request for an extension of time. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Gegg
Registration No. 50,857
Telephone No. 704-444-1024

CUSTOMER NO. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111
LEGAL02/30704740v1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON FEBRUARY 21, 2008.